

**REMARKS**

**Status of Claims:**

Claims 3, 6, 10, 13, 17, and 25 remain cancelled. Thus, claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-9, 11-12, 14-16, 18-24, and 26-30 are present for examination.

**Claim Rejection:**

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-9, 11-12, 14-16, 18-24, and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Arnold (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,848 B1).

With respect to claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-9, 11-12, 14-16, 18-24, and 26-30, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites an electronic mail transfer device which receives an electronic mail sent from a sending terminal through a communication line and sends at least a portion of the received electronic mail to a receiving terminal through the communication line according to an address of a destination party attached to the electronic mail, comprising:

“means for separating the electronic mail into first data including text data and second data when the received electronic mail includes the second data;

means for storing the second data;

means for inserting an identifier associated with the second data into the first data;

means for sending only the first data with the identifier to the receiving terminal, said identifier permitting for retrieval of the second data by the receiving terminal; and

means for deleting the second data from the means for storing upon receiving a deletion request from the receiving terminal **that is a request to delete the second data**, and for sending the second data to the receiving

terminal upon receiving a reception request from the receiving terminal that is a request to receive the second data.” (Emphasis Added).

An electronic mail transfer device including the above-quoted features has at least the advantages that the electronic mail transfer device includes: (i) means for separating an electronic mail into first data including text data and second data when the received electronic mail includes the second data; (ii) means for storing the second data; (iii) means for inserting an identifier associated with the second data into the first data; (iv) means for sending only the first data with the identifier to the receiving terminal, where the identifier permits for retrieval of the second data by the receiving terminal; and (v) **means for deleting the second data** from the means for storing **upon receiving a deletion request from the receiving terminal that is a request to delete the second data**, and for sending the second data to the receiving terminal upon receiving a reception request from the receiving terminal that is a request to receive the second data. (Specification; page 4, lines 8-11; page 16, lines 12-22; FIGs. 1-3).

Arnold neither discloses nor suggests an electronic mail transfer device including the above-quoted features with a **means for deleting second data** from a means for storing **upon receiving a deletion request from a receiving terminal that is a request to delete the second data**, and for sending the second data to the receiving terminal upon receiving a reception request from the receiving terminal that is a request to receive the second data.

With reference to Fig. 3 of Arnold, when a recipient in the system of Arnold desires to access an attachment, a check is made in step 306 to confirm that the recipient is on **an access list**. (Arnold; col. 4, lines 43-44). If the recipient is on the access list in Arnold, access to the attachment is provided in step 310. (Arnold; col. 4, line 46). Then, in the system of Arnold, after reading the attachment, the recipient is deleted from the access list in step 312. (Arnold; col. 4, lines 47-48). The **deletion of the recipient from the access list** in the system of Arnold may occur at the instruction of the recipient. (Arnold; col. 4, lines 48-49). Arnold explains that, preferably the only operation recipients may do is **delete themselves from the access list**. (Arnold; col. 4, lines 53-54).

The Examiner points to Arnold, column 4, lines 43-57, as disclosing “means for deleting the second data from the means for storing upon receiving a deletion request from the receiving terminal that is a request to delete the second data, and for sending the second data to the receiving terminal upon receiving a reception request from the receiving terminal that is a request to receive the second data.” (Office Action; pages 2-3) (Emphasis Added).

However, in the system of Arnold, a recipient is not able to send a deletion request to the server, where the deletion request is a request to delete the attachment. (Arnold; col. 4, lines 43-57). Rather, in the system of Arnold, preferably the only operation that recipients may do is delete themselves from the access list. (Arnold; col. 4, lines 53-54). Thus, the apparatus or server in Arnold does not include a means for deleting an attachment upon receiving a deletion request from a recipient that is a request to delete the attachment, because a recipient in the system of Arnold never sends a deletion request that is a request to delete the attachment. (Arnold; col. 4, lines 43-57).

As is illustrated in Fig. 3 of Arnold, deleting a recipient from the access list in step 312 is different from deleting the attachment from the server in step 316. (Arnold; Fig. 3). The system of Arnold only allows for deleting a recipient from the access list upon receiving an instruction from the recipient to delete the recipient from the access list. (Arnold; col. 4, lines 43-57). In contrast, an electronic mail transfer device of the present claim 1 includes, “means for deleting the second data from the means for storing upon receiving a deletion request from the receiving terminal that is a request to delete the second data”. (Emphasis Added). The system of Arnold does not allow for receiving a deletion request from a recipient that is a request to delete the attachment. (Arnold; col. 4, lines 43-57).

Therefore, the Arnold reference does not contain each and every limitation included in the present claim 1 and, hence, independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 8 recites an electronic mail transfer system with features similar to features of an electronic mail transfer device of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 8 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 15 recites an electronic mail transfer method with features similar to features of an electronic mail transfer device of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 15 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 23 recites an electronic mail transfer device with features similar to features of an electronic mail transfer device of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 23 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 29 recites an electronic mail transfer device with features similar to features of an electronic mail transfer device of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 29 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 30 recites an electronic mail transfer method with features similar to features of an electronic mail transfer device of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 30 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

The dependent claims are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons indicated above with regard to the independent claims from which they depend.

**Conclusion:**

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0872. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a

check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-0872.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0872.

Respectfully submitted,

Date January 16, 2007

By Justin M. Sobaje

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (310) 975-7965  
Facsimile: (310) 557-8475

Justin M. Sobaje  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 56,252